AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached two sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 1 and 2. These FIGs. have been amended to state "PRIOR ART."

MAR 2 2 2007

Application Serial No.: 10/500,374

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2006, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, are amended, claims 2, 6, and 7 are cancelled, and claim 17 is new. Note that claims 12-16 were withdrawn by election. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, and 17 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 4 at page 9 of the Office Action, which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Additionally, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 8-11, which would be allowed if corrected to overcome the objections to independent claim 5.

FIGs. 1 and 2 were objected to for not being designated by a legend stating "Prior Art."

The FIGs. have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions to state "Prior Art."

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, and 5 were objected to for minor informalities. These claims have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,479,940 to Ishizuka. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, "a first step of calculating a luminance accumulation value for each frame on the basis of a video input signal; and a second step of controlling an amplitude of the video input signal on the basis of the luminance accumulation value calculated in the first step, and feeding to the organic

electroluminescence display the video signal whose amplitude has been controlled and in that in the second step, the amplitude of the video input signal is controlled, when the luminance accumulation value calculated in the first step exceeds a predetermined value, such that the larger the difference between the luminance accumulation value and the predetermined value is, the smaller the amplitude of the video input signal becomes." Emphasis added.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). At a minimum, the cited prior art does not disclose (expressly or inherently) the above recited limitations.

The Office Action, at page 8, states that Ishizuka discloses all the limitations of claim 1 at FIGs. 3 and 6A-B.

However, Ishizuka merely discloses using the light adjustment controller 33 to control the voltage applied to the common electrode 18, thereby adjusting the display luminance for the light emitting panel 30. The light adjustment controller 33 includes a variable resistor operational by a user, and a light adjustment signal output from the light adjustment controller 33 is adjusted by the user, as shown in FIG. 3 and discussed at column 5, lines 36-41.

Additionally, Ishizuka, at FIGs. 6A and 6B, merely discloses that when a light adjustment signal indicative of halving the display luminance for the light emitting panel 30 is generated from the light adjustment controller 33, then the luminance of the emission luminance device 15 in every subfield becomes L/2 (is halved), which results in the reduction of the average of the light emission luminance in one frame period from 1.0 to 0.5. Actual measurement is not performed for the average of the light emission luminance in the frame period. Thus,

Ishizuka does not calculate the average value of the light emission luminance in the frame period. The light adjustment signal is adjusted by a user, and is not controlled by the average of the light emission luminance in the frame period.

Further, Ishizuka, at FIG. 7, merely discloses controlling the light adjustment signal based on a temperature detected by the detector 35.

Thus, Ishizuka does not teach or suggest "calculating a luminance accumulation value for each frame on the basis of a video input signal" and "controlling an amplitude of the video input signal on the basis of the luminance accumulation value" as recited by independent claim 1.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*. 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as independent claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon (claims 3 and 4) are also patentable.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Edwards Somi V.

Eduardo Garcia-Otero Registration No. 56,609

600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096 Phone: 202.756.8000 EG:SAB:mjb

Facsimile: 202.756.8087

Date: March 22, 2007

WDC99 1365985-1.070594.0030

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.